The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students
Volume 12 Special Issue, Summer 1993• Boise State University, Boise, ID 83725

ESL Policies and School Restructuring: Risks and Opportunities for Language Minority Students

Ofelia B. Miramontes

Introduction

Within the current reform movements, particularly those emphasizing participatory management, there are renewed opportunities to work toward providing more equitable instructional programs for linguistically diverse students. Such reform efforts call for individual schools, and the staff within those schools, to assume greater responsibility for meeting the needs of their communities. They also provide a greater voice for teachers in coordinating and

---

Ofelia B. Miramontes, PhD, is an associate professor of education at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Colorado.

cooperating on the development of programs for students within a school (Metz, 1990; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). The assumption is that as an educational community each site will have the knowledge, expertise, and commitment to improve programs for all of the children they serve. However, because such reforms decentralize decision making for educational policies and practices (placing most curricular decisions in the hands of the individual schools), they also have the potential for further fragmenting and reducing services for linguistically diverse students.

For minority groups the potential risk of site-based approaches is that where once there was strength in numbers (that is, policies for students were advocated based on a broader student constituency), the shift from interdistrict to site-specific articulation of programs neutralizes this position. Consequently it may directly place the responsibility for advocating, designing, implementing, maintaining, and assessing such programs on the handful of teachers who are most involved in working with linguistically diverse students—without their having the benefit of a higher authority to back them up. These teachers may now find themselves alone in their advocacy of particular positions for a relatively small number of students within their school site. They may also find themselves having to advance positions that are relatively unknown to the general education population, and that may be not only unpopular but highly controversial as well. Advancing such positions is particularly risky if advocacy is not legitimized and supported within the context of change.

It can be successfully argued, of course, that relying on centralized systems has proven to be unsatisfactory, that many district-wide policies and programs have traditionally been flawed, hindering rather than supporting the development of instructional efforts for LEP students, and that such failures are, in fact, the catalyst for reform. Nevertheless, restructuring itself is no panacea and presents some unique challenges to achieving and maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of programs for linguistically diverse students.

Since site-based management teams have the responsibility to set policy for their schools, they most directly affect general educational goals, allocation of resources, coordination and implementation of programs, response to community needs and community interaction (McKeon & Malarz, 1991). This requires that along with the right to choose and set policy, teachers take seriously the responsibility they concomitantly acquire to be informed decision makers. With regard to the education of language minority students, this means that teachers need not only know about first and second language acquisition but must also be able to critically analyze the merits or flaws of existing programs. Specifically, with regard to English as a second language instruction, this requires a hard look

at how we have arrived at some of the dismal policies affecting the achievement and English language development of linguistically diverse students (RAND Corp., 1991).

Although the issues in this paper may be familiar to most readers, for the most part they do not tend to be familiar to the majority of the general education community at large. The shift of responsibility for program development and implementation to a broader segment of this educational community requires that those who are knowledgeable and concerned with language minority issues be able to clearly articulate program necessities. This makes it critical to revisit and carefully review the basic premises and knowledge base developed regarding second language acquisition in order to ensure that the essential nature of second language learning does not disappear within the pragmatic concerns of reorganizing and reconceptualizing school structures.

Although this paper is primarily about English second language development, the issues discussed are addressed to both bilingual and monolingual English teachers. The paper is organized around five critical policy issues that have evolved in ESL program planning and implementation over the past decade. The faulty assumptions that are reflected in these issues and that have contributed to the fragmentation and limited success of these programs will be discussed. A theme which will recur throughout this paper is that English as a second language instruction is not considered *basic education* within our school systems. This position ultimately weakens the effectiveness of ESL programs, severely impeding the effectiveness of most ESL instructional efforts.

ESL: a stepchild in the curriculum

Despite the rhetoric that has been generated about the necessity for all Americans to speak English—passage of English-only legislation and virulent attacks on primary language use and instruction (Peterson, 1989; Porter, 1990) —school programs for the development of English language skills for language diverse students continue to be woefully inadequate (Fradd & Weismantel, 1989; National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1988). Blame for the low levels of English proficiency believed to exist in language minority communities continues to be ascribed to bilingual educators, who by advocating bilingual instruction, as the rhetoric goes, have limited English language opportunities. Blame also goes to the non-English speaking/bilingual communities, who are accused of not caring enough and shirking their civic responsibility to develop English in their communities. This rhetoric continues to be a prevalent and

convenient smokescreen for the poor performance of many school systems in providing for the education of language minority students.

As indicated above, undermining most ESL programs within districts is the fundamental attitude that ESL instruction is supplemental and somewhat incidental. This attitude is highlighted in the following example. In an effort to consolidate services, two school districts recently developed ESL centers. Their rationale for developing these services was to consolidate resources in an attempt to provide less fragmented services to limited English proficient students. However, parents who did not want their children transported to these centers were allowed to waive ESL services. Rather than recognizing English as a second language development as a basic responsibility and curricular area that must be addressed for all students with limited English proficiency, this policy reflects the extent to which schools take language for granted. Offering ESL as a choice to parents is equivalent to a district creating a center for the learning of reading and allowing parents to waive their child's literacy instruction. How is learning English less basic? The attitude that ESL is supplemental surfaces again and again in examples of staffing, time allocation, and integration of ESL into the curriculum, issues which will be discussed below.

In the above example the school district was trying to address the need for better program implementation, even though their fundamental assumption regarding the importance of second language instruction ultimately may leave many students unserved. Such policies contribute to perpetuating the extraordinary statistics of *nonserved* language minority students which have been reported in the literature. Approximately 85% of eligible students receive no services (either bilingual or ESL) at all (National Council of La Raza, 1985; Olson, 1986). These statistics point to a lack of concern on the part of educational systems to improve the learning situation of second language students—all rhetoric aside.

Even when students do receive ESL services, the level and quality of these services are often questionable. Several additional faulty assumptions have continued to guide language development instructional policies, affecting decisions regarding the design of ESL programs and ultimately weakening their effectiveness. They include such notions as the following: (a) Minimal support leads to development of language skills sufficient for academic success; (b) if content is repeated often enough it will eventually be understood; and (c) if there is a lot of talk in the classroom environment students are automatically insured of language development. Although addressed and debunked in studies reviewed by Wong-Fillmore & Valadez (1986) and others, these attitudes still persist in schools.

ESL services also tend to be limited in scope and to reflect a great deal of variability in quality and allotment of instructional time across programs even within a single district (National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1988). They traditionally last only one or two years and offer limited daily instructional time (Nadeau & Miramontes, 1988); have restricted content which is often not linked to the content of the students' other educational activities (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989; Berman, *et al.*, 1992); are inadequately monitored; and, are often taught by tutors or paraprofessionals with minimal training (National Forum on Personnel Needs, 1990). These conditions give rise to four additional issues that must be addressed if ESL programs are to improve. These issues are discussed below.

Issue 1: What is ESL, really?

In order to address some of the most deleterious assumptions with regard to ESL instruction, a common base of understanding needs to be developed and shared within a site-based decision-making setting if sound educational decisions are the goal. As indicated, there is a lack of clarity as well as many misunderstandings about what ESL is and what it is intended to accomplish. Figure 1 presents some basic premises reflecting essential areas which might govern the design and implementation of ESL programs. They are presented in juxtaposition to some current interpretations of ESL in order to emphasize their unique nature.

Each of the premises reflecting what ESL <u>is</u> has particular implications for the kinds of issues that must be understood and negotiated within a system of participatory management if language minority students are to be adequately served within a school community. Premises regarding what ESL <u>is not</u> reflect faulty assumptions which often dictate the level of services.

For a school moving toward site-based management, clear distinctions about the nature of ESL must be determined and used to maintain the integrity of English development for second language learners. They must be used during the restructuring process to guide decision making with regard to instruction and to prevent the reshuffling of the school configurations to reflect only structural rather than instructional shifts.

Figure 1. Basic premises for English as a Second language instruction[1].

WHAT ESL IS	WHAT ESL IS NOT
•essential language development for L2 speakers	•special or remedial education
•planned, daily instruction for second language acquisition	•just being in an all-English environment
•separate instruction time when L2 learners have the opportunity to express themselves	•an instructional time when L2 learners have to compete with fluent English speakers in order to participate
•second language development through comprehensible content area instruction	•simply language arts for native English speakers
•sequential, strategic curriculum delivery using ESL methodologies	•tutoring
•communication-based	•grammar-based
•teaching English to L2 students, which may include multicultural perspectives	•multicultural education
•incorporating multicultural aspects	•an assimilation program
•an essential, integral part of the students' academic program	•supplemental
•coordinated with, and reinforced by, the classroom teacher at the elementary level	•an isolated language learning program
•a program whose implementation is the responsibility of certified personnel with ESL training	•the responsibility of para-professional personnel
•the provision of English language support in the transition from explicit ESL instruction to modified classroom curriculum	•not abrupt cessation of English language support

[1]Developed with L. Widger-Alire, M. Carr, M. Olguin, A. Frant, D. Lester, and G. Trapp.

Issue 2: ESL's role in the broader curriculum

In site-based schemes school staff assume a major responsibility for determining the direction of the curriculum. Therefore, they need to assess the interaction and impact of particular curricular strategies on English as a second language development. Two curriculum change movements are presently having a significant impact on the implementation of ESL instruction: (a) the movement toward process oriented approaches to instruction; and (b) the movement toward development of more cooperative, integrative classroom settings.

(a) *Structure vs. process.* Certainly, although approaches such as whole language for reading and cooperative learning strategies for social studies and science have opened many opportunities for students to experience a broader and more meaningful interaction with learning, they have also raised questions and concerns among teachers with relation to their role in direct, intentional, mediated instruction. For example, because these philosophies and strategies for instruction are difficult to implement masterfully, many teachers are unsure of their role regarding students' instruction and as a result are hesitant to exert their role as teacher for fear of interrupting the process. Peer interaction is often the default position, regardless of quality. The lack of balance between the basic orientations of process vs. direct instruction, student vs. teacher input, and unstructured vs. structured time have caused critics to question the loss of access some children will have to more directed, specific interactions with teachers. For example, as Delpit (1989) and others have argued, it is often important to make explicit the aims and rules of instruction (the hidden curriculum), particularly for children who have little experience with the implicit culture of classrooms. And, although excited by the possibilities these process strategies provide, many teachers themselves worry about how students will learn the basic skills they need.

Process approaches have also tended to make many teachers reluctant to structure time for specific activities such as ESL (a phenomenon particularly prevalent although by no means unique to bilingual classes). Instead, the fact that English is used in the setting is considered to be sufficient. As the reasoning goes, either plenty of English is used, particularly with peers, so that students will pick up the language, or students are considered to be in a bilingual setting, so they'll understand (i.e., it can be translated for them). In the first case, it is extremely difficult to understand how this position is different from the sink or swim position so soundly refuted by experience and research (Krashen, 1983,

1986; Cummins, 1984). In the second case, using one language to mediate the other is a poor strategy for developing a sophisticated use of either language (Wong-Fillmore, 1986). Nevertheless, throughout the educational system these faulty assumptions persist.

(b) *Integrating ESL into regular classroom activities.* Schools involved in reform are generally actively seeking to develop new patterns of interaction between and among students and teachers. As discussed above, ESL programs generally have been conducted on a pull-out basis and lack coherence with regular classroom activities. There has long been an obvious need to link ESL curriculum to the content and activity of the classroom (Chamot & O'Malley, 1989).

And yet, adopting a policy which completely integrates LEP students into the regular classroom often becomes a double edged sword. Although total separation from the regular program is a distinct limitation of all specialized programs (Allington, 1991), totally assimilating ESL into the regular classroom program can (though need not) result in a default to submersion with no special attention given to specific linguistic interactions and elaboration of the ability to use English for academic content. The process approaches as well as movements toward integrating curriculum often blur the line between the necessity to address specific needs and the drive never to place students in homogeneous groups for special instruction. In fact, they are often perceived to be competing objectives.

Because the tendency in classrooms is toward directing instruction at the level of the native English speaker, much of what is being communicated in a classroom may not be fully comprehensible to the limited English proficient student (Krashen, 1984). Consequently, many language minority students miss a great deal of information and can also become inhibited from fully expressing themselves in situations where they must compete constantly with those more proficient than themselves.

This sense of timidity can be intensified when there is not a critical mass of language minority students within the classroom setting. Policies which encourage diffusing the language minority population throughout the school, while giving the broader school population the opportunity to interact with children of different language and cultural backgrounds, often diffuses the instructional efforts to address more specifically the needs of the language minority child. This is tantamount to making minority children a part of other children's curriculum, sometimes at the expense of their own development.

Eliminating small, homogeneous groups which may be one of the few settings in which limited English proficient students can comfortably play with language,

practice their second language in a safe environment, and develop their English proficiency in a noncompetitive setting, severely restricts their overall opportunities for English language development. The result is often little proficiency in expressing themselves on academic subjects (Commins & Miramontes, 1989). Eventually this takes its toll in other areas such as written expression. Carlos, in the following example, is a child for whom total integration has yielded limited understanding. Carlos is in a school that focuses a great deal of attention on experiential learning. The environment is full of wonderful materials. In one corner a group is putting together a chicken skeleton, in another the students are labeling the bones in the body using a model they have made, and in another a child is reading a story to several of her classmates. Carlos moves from group to group, but most of the conversations move too quickly for him. He can usually understand what the teacher is trying to get across but usually only points or nods in reply. When he goes home he tells his mother about the general nature of the activities, but he does not remember the specific words for the different topics he has heard about in class. He does not know how to say femur, knuckles, etc. Although the environment is rich in language, much of it is inaccessible to Carlos because he does not understand a great deal of what is being communicated. In addition, he finds it difficult to express himself when conversations move quickly. Carlos' case presents an example of how integration can become submersion and raises a dilemma with regard to whether students should ever be homogeneously grouped.

Given the negative findings on tracking which has been particularly harmful to minority students (Oaken, 1985), caution must be exercised in planning instructional groups. However, there are multiple ways of grouping students throughout a day, throughout an instructional sequence, and throughout theme cycles which balance special needs with integrative experiences.

Issues raised by the discussion of structure vs. process as well as the integration of both children and curriculum movements highlight the fact that schools as institutions and students as individuals sometimes have competing needs that must be balanced. Rather than throwing them both out, a balance needs to be struck between grouping for specific purposes and integrating students. This balance is dependent on a school staff developing an understanding of what is *unique* about second language instruction—that is, what types of opportunities need to be provided, what level of development and proficiency must be attained in order to successfully achieve academically, and what it takes to achieve this proficiency. In this respect, ESL is not simply the use of specific methodologies but also includes those methodologies used in particular contexts. It can also be thought of as learning to function effectively in English across a

variety of situations. ESL exists primarily within situational interactions—opportunities to try English skills in a nonthreatening, noncompetitive environment; opportunities to rely solely on their second language understanding; opportunities to articulate academic ideas that will need to be intellectually defended and supported; opportunities to learn to read and write; and opportunities for social language interactions. School instructional policies which disregard the need to balance competing needs will not enhance learning for second language students.

This brings us back to the idea that the level at which students will need to function across settings must be assessed in relationship to the demands that will be placed on them—the types of proficiency that the school expects for academic success and that their bilingual as well as monolingual communities require for social and affective success (Zentalla, 1988). For example, social oral proficiency alone is not sufficient because literacy is necessary for a variety of forms of success; literacy without social oral proficiency, on the other hand, is not sufficient because of the need to communicate orally at school, in jobs, and socially in *both* communities. Students then, must be able to engage in the types of activities that will produce success in the variety of settings in which they will be required to perform.

Issue 3: Special funding dictating pedagogy

Under site-based management, school staff have more say in the way resources are distributed and used within a school. Staff make judgements about what programs and instructional strategies are most important to develop and maintain. Although some categorical funding will continue to be targeted for particular programs, it will be important for schools to examine the damaging tendency to allow special funding to dictate pedagogy. For example, pressures to maintain the criteria for movement of students out of ESL at minimal levels persist in most school districts. Although research evidence indicates that it takes five years or more for students with limited English proficiency to achieve academic proficiency in English (Cummins, 1981; Collier, 1989), services for those students who receive them are typically only funded for two to three years (Nadeau & Miramontes, 1988). Therefore, criteria for termination of services are often reduced to the minimum time that state funding for such services is provided. Aside from the fact that students may not have had sufficient time to develop academic proficiency in English which would allow them to be able to deal successfully with a broad variety of content, movement out of ESL

programs leaves general education teachers believing that students are "fixed," and are ready to perform just like native English speakers. Such assumptions set into motion a chain of perceptions that can limit opportunities for language minority students.

Since most general education teachers have had only minimal (if any) exposure to second language acquisition requirements and methodologies, it is perhaps not extraordinary that they interpret termination of ESL services this way (Urzua, 1989). In addition, since program planning for ESL students is generally handled outside of the classroom, discussions among staff rarely focus on the role of general education teachers in ESL. Therefore, the need for specific support systems within the classroom is not highlighted, and the fact that classroom teacher involvement and support should actually intensify *after* ESL services are terminated, is not discussed. Classroom teachers do not recognize the critical role they need to play in the continued linguistic development of second language learners (Rigg & Allen, 1989). Transitions to all-English instruction with support rarely occur, and instead students may find themselves from one day to the next receiving instruction and competing for grades as if they were native English speakers (Shannon, 1991).

A minimalist approach to second language needs tends to maintain and reinforce additional faulty assumptions such as the belief that with 30-60 minutes of English language instruction per day ESL students should be able to acquire and use English at a level of proficiency similar to that of native speakers. At the same time, of course, they are also expected to learn all new content through this second language.

The allocation of resources function of site-based management teams has the potential for changing the short-sighted, negative policies of allowing legislative funding to dictate instructional programs. School policies can be changed to reflect pedagogical understandings of second language acquisition not simply to reflect legislative resource allocations. This means that ESL instruction would be supported and reinforced throughout the LEP students' curriculum to promote attainment of academic goals, and that general education teachers with ESL students in their classes would use second language strategies in their instruction. This of course will be seen as increasingly difficult to accomplish in an era of shrinking resources. Reorganization is certainly no guarantee of positive and effective change, since its success depends directly on the composition, knowledge, orientation, and collaboration of the school staff. However, creative solutions which use resources more effectively can emerge out of restructuring schools and coordinating school programs.

Issue 4: The general educator's responsibility in ESL

Present policies in schools of education which exclude ESL instruction as part of the required knowledge base for new teachers to teach successfully and district requirements for employment that fail to include a background in first and second language acquisition also serve to reinforce the idea that English second language development is not basic education. Such policies significantly impede the sharing of responsibility for ESL instruction within school sites. Goal setting and coordination of programs, however, is an important function of site based teams. As a community of professional educators, staff in such schools are specifically charged with the responsibility for making decisions with regard to the most effective progress for children within their community. Schools that participate in site-based decision making, therefore, have increased possibilities of linking and articulating student programs across grades.

Traditionally, a major limiting factor for the development of English language proficiency for limited English proficient students has been that ESL programs have tended to be understaffed, with students frequently receiving a majority of their instruction from paraprofessionals (National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1988). The consequences of such policies have been limited and fragmented second language acquisition experiences for students. Although well intentioned, paraprofessionals too often lack the training and skills necessary to design and implement instruction for language and literacy development (California State Department of Education, 1984). When ESL instruction is not coordinated with and reinforced by the classroom teachers, teachers are not able to follow the LEP students' progress, they may engage in very little direct instruction with these students, and in general they may have little contact with them.

When students have limited access to the teachers, they are less likely to encounter the notions of language development as expanding the capability to articulate arguments clearly, as a vehicle for learning to analyze ideas, and as an expression of meaning. Disconnecting teachers from the learning of limited English proficient students therefore creates a lack of appreciation for student growth, diminishes understanding of what the student needs, and can foster a sense of helplessness on the part of the teacher toward a student. The sense of responsibility for student instruction is undermined when teachers feel that student needs are being better met elsewhere.

The cummulative effect of inadequate language support over time has been devastating for many Latino students. The consequence of the combination of

limited support and lack of development in English second language skills has been that limited English proficient students are often promptly placed in remedial reading (with all its attendant stigmas) when ESL services terminate. For example, Juan had been in ESL for two years. He was a lively and talkative youngster, communicated well with his classmates, and made great progress. His classroom teacher felt that it was time for him to participate more fully in his classroom, and she reported that he enjoyed taking reading books home to share with his mother. At the time, his ESL teacher had informally invited Juan to share those books with her, and although he was able to tell a story about the pictures, he was able to read only a very few words. Nevertheless, his oral proficiency was much better than most of the other students in her ESL class.

It was decided that Juan was ready to move out of ESL. He was placed in the low reading group in his classroom, with great hopes that he would be able to move to a higher level within a few months. As time passed, however, his teacher was disappointed by his inability to catch on to the stories he was reading. His oral reading was slow and halting, and he often seemed confused. It was decided that Juan needed special help with reading, and he was accepted for remedial reading with the reading specialist. Although Juan began to progress slowly with special help focused on phonetic instruction and repetition, his teachers felt they had misjudged his ability to succeed. They wondered if, perhaps, he might have a learning disability which was hindering his progress.

Without clear communication and articulation among programs about second language issues within a school, teachers of remedial reading often function under the faulty assumption that students have received adequate exposure to and practice with English (otherwise the child would be in ESL) and that an appropriate developmental sequence of instruction has been used in their reading instruction. They then proceed to use a remedial approach because they believe that the students have not succeeded even though they have been provided with an adequate opportunity to learn to read. The problems attendant to remedial reading programs become the determiners of the next phase of many linguistically diverse students' education. Disconnected pull-out services become the norm, and reductionist curricula often further limit their opportunities to develop more advanced skills in English (Diaz, 1986). Consequently, language minority students move into their own track, a track many students never leave. It often includes various sorts of remediation and may eventually lead to special education placement (Ortiz & Maldonado, 1986; Miramontes, 1988).

This cycle is no doubt also familiar to most readers. It occurs when little or no effort is made to support language minority students as they work to develop the ability to deal with all content, across all areas of the curriculum in the same

fashion as a native English speaker. These students usually find themselves alone in their struggle to negotiate the curriculum, and it is perhaps not surprising that so many give up the fight. Readers may recognize such students as those labelled by many educators as "mixed-dominant" and ascribed poor conceptual skills (Commins & Miramontes, 1989; Ruiz, 1989; Trueba, 1989). Until there is a broader understanding and acceptance of what it takes to become academically proficient in a second language and to live successfully in bilingual communities, and until second language support is coordinated across academic contexts over time, the toll will continue.

Site-based approaches have the potential for creating learning communities where there is true shared responsibility for student instruction throughout the school and for counteracting policies which isolate instruction for language minority students. A school that understands and is working closely with its community would be expected to take a more comprehensive approach to the development of students' academic skills over time. Criteria for terminating support services for second language learners can be made more congruent with the performance expected of students across academic contexts.

Summary and Conclusions

Reform efforts, particularly those focused on site-based management approaches have the potential to improve awareness, cooperation, and instructional programs within schools and to stimulate greater parent and community involvement. On the other hand greater individual school autonomy presents the potential for further fragmenting efforts and resources for language minority students if the requirements for student learning are not more broadly understood by the staff.

What are the implications of this changing social and management structure within schools for English second language instruction? First it will be critical for all school staff to understand what aspects of ESL instruction can and cannot be traded off structurally if students are to succeed academically in English. Second, instructional programs need to be strengthened.

The following can be considered a partial checklist of factors that need to be addressed as a school staff work through their reorganization process.

1. Policies which clearly define the nature of ESL services must be explicitly articulated in order to clarify instructional goals and intended outcomes and to guide the restructuring of programs for LEP students.
2. Congruence between a school's goals for its limited English proficient

students and the experiences and instruction it provides for them must be examined and critically evaluated.

3. A careful examination of the assumptions and values reflected in existing English second language instructional policies must be conducted, particularly as they reflect the current knowledge base in research and practice.

4. The roles of individuals within the total school program must be re-examined and redefined in relation to second language learning.

5. Differences between ESL and remedial reading instructional programs—in terms of criteria for establishing need, differences in learners' background, and differences in approach for first and second language speakers—must be generally understood throughout the school.

6. Policies and rhetoric which divide ethnic and linguistic communities and staff must be discouraged and replaced.

7. Policies which support consideration of remedial reading as the backup support for language minority student must also be eliminated.

8. Paths which lead students directly from ESL to remedial services must be identified and eliminated.

9. Schemes for integrating language minority students into the curriculum that merely include these students physically in activities without adaptions for comprehension must not be allowed.

10. Policies which deny the need for grouping and intentional instruction that provides second language speakers a safe, nonthreatening, noncompetitive setting in which to practice and explore second language learning must be examined. Finding creative and positive ways of balancing groupings and types of instruction for particular needs should to be given a high priority.

11. Policies which reflect expectations that general education teachers should play an active role in second language instruction must be developed and made explicit across educational institutions.

12. Policies that promote the inclusion of students' language, values, and culture so that a bilingual child's languages do not become an either/or proposition must be implemented.

13. Finally, the recognition needs to be developed that children who live in bilingual homes will always have need for their bilingualism, and that they may experience language differently than monolinguals making it critical to foster connections.

If all this sounds like what we should already be doing, it is. But we aren't. And, if there is to be any chance that real changes in instructional practices for language minority students are to result from school reform, we cannot expect to see improvements until the same old problems are met head on. New words

will not change reality, and the pitfalls that restructuring movements present must be examined.

References

Allington, R. (1991). Children who find learning to read difficult: School responses to diversity. In E. Hiebert (Ed.), *Literacy for a diverse society: Perspectives, programs and policies*, 237-252.

Berman, P., Chambers, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., Olsen, L., & Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity, Volume I, Executive Summary.* Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

California State Department of Education. (1984). *Bilingual- Crosscultural Teacher Aides: A Resource Guide.* Sacramento, CA.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession: Washington, D. C.

Chamot, A. H., & O'Malley, J. M. (1989). The cognitive academic language learning approach. In Rigg, P. and Allen, V. G. *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom.* Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, pp. 108-125.

Collier, V. P. (1989). How long: A synthesis of research on academic achievement in second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23 (23), 509-531.

Commins, N. L., & Miramontes, O. B. (1989). A descriptive study of the linguistic abilities of a selected group of low achieving Hispanic bilingual students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 140-154.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* San Diego, CA: College Hill.

Delpit, L. (1989). The Silenced Dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-298.

Diaz, S., Moll, L. C., & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in instruction: A context specific approach. In California State Department of Education (Eds.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language*

minority children, 187-230. Los Angeles: Evaluation Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Fradd, S. H., & Weismantel, M. J. (1989). *Meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically different students: A handbook for educators.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrel, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach.* New York: Pergamon Press.

McKeon, D., & Malarz, L. (1991). *School based management: What bilingual and ESL program directors should know.* Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Metz, M. H. (1990). Some missing elements in the educational reform movement. In S. B. Bacharach, *Education Reform: Making sense of it all.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Miramontes, O. B. (1990). A comparative study of English oral reading skill in differently schooled groups of Hispanic students. *Journal of Reading Behavior,* XXII(4), pp. 373-394.

Miramontes, O. B. (1987). Oral reading miscues of Hispanic good and learning disabled students: Implications for second language reading. In Goldman, S. R., & Trueba, H. T. (Eds.), *Becoming literate in English as a second language.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Nadeau, A., & Miramontes, O. B. (1988). The reclassification of limited English proficient students: Assessing the inter-relationship of selected variables. *NABE Journal,* 12(3), 219-242.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students. (1988). *New voices: Immigrant students in U.S. public schools.* Boston, MA.

National Council of La Raza (1985). *The education of Hispanics: Selected statistics.* Office of Research Advocacy and Legislation. Washington, DC.

National Forum on Personnel Needs for Districts with Changing Demographics. (1990). *Staffing the multilingually impacted schools of the 1990s.* Washington,

D. C.: U.S. Department of Education. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Olson, L. (1986). Many bilingual pupils unaided, study finds. In *Education Week*, V(17), 1.

Ortiz, A. A., & Maldonado-Colon, E. (1986). Recognizing learning disabilities in bilingual children: How to lessen inappropriate referrals of language minority students to special education. *Journal of Reading, Writing and Learning Disabilities International*, 43(1), 47-56.

Peterson, S. (1989). A practicing teacher's views on bilingual education: The need for reform. In Imhoff, G. (Ed.), *Learning Two Languages*, pp. 241-260. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Porter, R. P. (1990). *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education.* New York: Basic Books.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

RAND, Corp. (1991). *Decentralization and accountability in public education.* Santa Monica, CA.

Rigg, P., & Allen, V. G. (1989). *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom.* Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Ruiz, N. (1989). An optimal learning environment for Rosemary. *Exceptional Children*, 56, 130-144.

Shannon, S. M. (in press). Transition from bilingual programs to all-English programs; Issues about and beyond language. *Linguistics and Education.*

Trueba, H. T. (1989). English literacy acquisition: For cultural trauma to learning disabilities in minority students. *Linguistics & Education*, 1, 125-151.

Urzua, C. (1989). I grow for a living. In Rigg, P. & Allen, V. G. *When they don't all speak English: Integrating the ESL student into the regular classroom.* Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, pp. 15-38.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. Third Edition. New York: Macmillan.

Zentalla, A. C. (1988). The language situation of Puerto Ricans. In S. L. McKay & A. C. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity, problem or resource* (pp. 140-165). New York: Newbury House.